Appl. No. B-34387
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 5 December 2003

Page 6 of 11

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are pending in the application.

Applicants thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents, and for acknowledging that the drawings are acceptable.

Applicants also gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 3 and 4 define patentable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims from which they depend.

Claim 1 has been amended for clarification. The claim is not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added. Claim 8 has been cancelled, and new claims 9-have been added. No new matter is added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objected to claim 1. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment should clarify the claim sufficiently for the Examiner and thereby overcome the objection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants have cancelled claim 8. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is deemed moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102/103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over Saito et al. EP 0837579 A2 ("Saito").

Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections for at least the following reasons.

Appl. No. B-34387
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 5 December 2003

Page 7 of 11

Claim 1

Among other things, in the system of claim 1 a device of a first cluster holds a stored software representation of operation features of a selected device of a second cluster.

Applicants respectfully submit that Saito does not disclose a system including this feature.

The Office Action cited FIGs. 1 and 2 as supposedly showing all of the features of claim 1. Saito teaches that the AV control terminals 2, 5 in FIG. 1 store **attribute** information regarding devices of the other cluster. However, Saito does not teach that the control terminals 2, 5 store any **software representation of operation features** of devices of the other cluster. In that regard, inspection of the table in FIG. 6 of Saito indicates that the AV control terminals 2 and 5 only store general attributes of a device on the other cluster (e.g., "DVD Player, "TV, " etc.). Saito does not teach that the AV control terminals store an actual software representation (e.g., a Device Control Module) of operation features of devices connected to the other cluster that might, for example, permit a device in the first cluster to actually control a device in the second cluster.

In this regard, for example, Saito teaches that when a user in one location wants to receive video from a selected device on a cluster at a different location, the user has to operate a first AV control terminal associated with the cluster at the user's location. This first AV control terminal then communicates with a second AV control terminal that belongs to the same cluster as the selected device. It is that second AV control terminal which then is able to actually transmit an instruction to the selected device. Evidently, the first AV control device does not possess any software representation of operation features of the selected device that would enable it to interact with and control the selected device. This is consistent with the teaching of Saito that the AV control terminal only stores general attributes of devices on another cluster, and does not possess any software representation of operation features of the devices.

Appl. No. B-34387
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 5 December 2003

Page 8 of 11

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the system of claim 1 is patentable over <u>Saito</u>.

<u>Claims 2 and 5-7</u>

Claims 2 and 5-7 all depend from claim 1 and are therefore deemed patentable over <u>Saito</u> for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

<u>NEW CLAIMS 9-17</u>

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 9-17

Applicants respectfully submit that each of these claims is supported by the original specification, and is patentable over <u>Saito</u> for at least the following reasons.

<u>Claim 9</u>

Among other things, in the system of claim 9 the software representation of operational features of the selected device of the second cluster represents a control system of the selected device. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, lines 29-31. Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Saito</u> fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 from which it depends.

<u>Claim 10</u>

Among other things, in the system of claim 10 the software representation of operational features of the selected device of the second cluster comprises a Device Control Module for the selected device. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, lines 29-31. Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Saito</u> fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 from which it depends.

<u>Claim 11</u>

Among other things, in the system of claim 11, the software representation of operational features of the selected device of the second cluster is executed on the

Appl. No. B-34387
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 5 December 2003

Page 9 of 11

device of the first cluster wishing to interact with said selected device. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, line 31 - page 10, line 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Saito fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 from which it depends.

Claim 12

Among other things, in the system of claim 12 the selected device of the second cluster is a video recorder, and a software representation of operational features of the video recorder is executed on a set top box of the first cluster. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, line 31 - page 10, line 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Saito fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 from which it depends.

Claim 13

Among other things, the device of claim 13 includes means for storing a software representation of operational features of a second device that is connected to a different one of the data buses than the data bus to which the first device itself is connected. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 6, line 25 - page 7, line 7. Applicants respectfully submit that Saito fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 14

Among other things, in the system of claim 14 a first device of a first cluster stores a software representation of operational features of a selected device of a second cluster, permitting a second device of the first cluster to control the selected device by executing the software representation. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, line 29 - page 10, line 9. Applicants respectfully submit that Saito fails to disclose such a feature.

Appl. No. B-34387
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 5 December 2003

Page 10 of 11

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is allowable for at least these reasons.

<u>Claim 15</u>

Among other things, in the system of claim 15 a stored representation is modified on receipt by the first device of the first cluster, in response to limitations of the data channel. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 10, lines 20-27. Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Saito</u> fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14 from which it depends.

<u>Claim 16</u>

Among other things, in the system of claim 16 the software representation of operational features of the selected device of the second cluster comprises a Device Control Module for the selected device. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, lines 29-31. Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Saito</u> fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14 from which it depends.

<u>Claim 17</u>

Among other things, in the system of claim 17, the selected device of the second cluster is a video recorder, and a software representation of operational features of the video recorder is executed on a set top box of the first cluster. Such a feature is disclosed, for example, at page 9, line 31 - page 10, line 1. Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Saito</u> fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable for at least these reasons, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14 from which it depends.

Appl. No. B-34387
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 5 December 2003

Page 11 of 11

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-7 and 9-17 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (703) 715-0870 to discuss these matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment (except for the issue fee) to Deposit Account No. 50-0238 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, P.L.L.C.

Date: 5 March 2004

By:

Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, P.L.L.C.
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone No.: (703) 715-0870
Facsimile No.: (703) 715-0877

Atty. Docket No. B-34387